



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,741	01/11/2001	Vincent Leroux	1366 US	9031

25105 7590 12/16/2003

VESUVIUS CRUCIBLE COMPANY
27 NOBLESTOWN RD
CARNEGIE, PA 15106-1632

EXAMINER

DICUS, TAMRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/758,741

Applicant(s)

LEROUX ET AL.

Examiner

Tamra L. Dicus

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's RCE filed 11-07-03. Cancellation of claims 7-18 are acknowledged. All objections, 101, and 112 rejections are withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1 (amended) -3, 6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,691,061 to Hanse et al.

7. Hanse teaches a refractory shape having a coating. The body is of a refractory material (2) having a layer (10) that covers the body partially or completely that is oxidized, also comprising a slagline collar (8) or liner (10) which functions as an insulative coating (includes substantially covering), with a layer of glaze (3) which has the purpose of preventing oxidation of the refractory material during preheating and use. See col. 4, lines 25-40. A bore is defined in Figure 5 (new claim 24). The material contains carbon, a binder, and alumina at col. 4, lines 45-50. At col. 6, lines 50-60, teaches carbon-containing graphite as part of the refractory material. Figures 1 and 6 show a nozzle, thin and curved.

Art Unit: 1774

8. Claims 1 (amended)-2, 6 and 24 (new) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,370,370 to Benson.

10. Benson discloses a carbon-bonded, oxide refractory body in the form of a nozzle for use in casting molten metal, such as aluminum-killed steel (see col. 5, line 12+), where sleeve 16 serves as an insulative coating the substantially covers the nozzle forming a second outer surface, where the exterior second surface is coated with a glaze of a glass forming frit material (see col. 6, line 20+). See Figure. A bore is defined in the Figure (new claim 24). Benson discovered that a carbon-bonded, oxide refractory material such as carbon-bonded alumina graphite in the form of a nozzle can be used to form an anti-buildup liner which is resistant to carbon monoxide gas and resistant to the formation and buildup of alumina (see col. 5, line 12+). Benson applies a glaze to the body to protect the exterior surface of the body against oxidation during firing of the nozzle (see col. 6, line 24+).

11. Claims 1 (amended) and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,908,577 to Yamamura et al.

12. Yamamura teaches a nozzle for continuous casting of molten metal. The nozzle body 10 has a first surface (encompasses thin-slab nozzle of claim 4), the inner wall part 11 is over 10 (functioning as an outer surface, see Figure 1). The inner wall acts as an insulative coating. Yamamura teaches the green ceramic body is fired, inherently producing a glaze over 11 at col. 9, lines 55-60. At col. 4, lines 4-15, a carbon-containing graphite material is taught. A bore is defined in Figures 1-2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,691,061 to

Hanse et al., as applied to claim 1 above, in view of WO 99/65842 to Brandy.

Hanse essentially claims the instant invention. Hanse does not provide an insulative coating composition as that recited in instant claim 5. However, Brandy discloses an insulative coating composition especially suited for refractory materials such as sleeves at page 1, lines 1-20. The coating provided includes the composition of instant claim 5, teaching insulative microspheres in use at page 2, lines 1-10, page 3, lines 20-30, patented claims 1 and 7, providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the refractive article of Benson to further include a refractive insulative coating composition as instant claim 5 requires because Brandy provides the composition for the purpose of providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. That the metal is capable of melting is not germane since it has been held that an element that is "being able to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138.

11. Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN

5,691,061 to Hanse et al. in view of WO 99/65842 to Brandy.

Art Unit: 1774

Hanse teaches a refractory shape having a coating. The body is of a refractory material (2) having a layer (10) that covers the body partially or completely that is oxidized, also comprising a slagline collar (8) or liner (10) which functions as an insulative coating (includes substantially covering), with a layer of glaze (3) which has the purpose of preventing oxidation of the refractory material during preheating and use. See col. 4, lines 25-40. A bore is defined in Figure 5 (new claim 24). The material contains carbon, a binder, and alumina at col. 4, lines 45-50. At col. 6, lines 50-60, teaches carbon-containing graphite as part of the refractory material. Figures 1 and 6 show a nozzle, thin and curved.

Hanse does not provide an insulative coating composition as that recited in instant claims 19 and 22. However, Brandy discloses an insulative coating composition especially suited for refractory materials such as sleeves at page 1, lines 1-20. The coating provided includes the composition of instant claim 5, teaching insulative microspheres in use at page 2, lines 1-10, page 3, lines 20-30, patented claims 1 and 7, providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the refractive article of Hanse to further include a refractive insulative coating composition as instant claim 5 requires because Brandy provides the composition for the purpose of providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. That the metal is capable of melting is not germane since it has been held that an element that is "being able to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138.

12. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,370,370 to

Art Unit: 1774

Benson in view of WO 99/65842 to Brandy, as applied to claim 1 above.

13. Benson essentially claims the instant invention. As previously stated, Benson does not provide an insulative coating composition as that recited in instant claim 5. However, Brandy discloses an insulative coating composition especially suited for refractory materials such as sleeves at page 1, lines 1-20. The coating provided includes the composition of instant claim 5, teaching insulative microspheres in use at page 2, lines 1-10, page 3, lines 20-30, patented claims 1 and 7, providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the refractive article of Benson to further include a refractive insulative coating composition as instant claim 5 requires because Brandy provides the composition for the purpose of providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. That the metal is capable of melting is not germane since it has been held that an element that is "being able to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense.

In re Hutchinson, 69 USPQ 138.

14. Claims 19-23 (new) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,370,370 to Benson in view of WO 99/65842 to Brandy.

Benson discloses a carbon-bonded, oxide refractory body in the form of a nozzle for use in casting molten metal, such as aluminum-killed steel (see col. 5, line 12+), where sleeve 16 serves as an insulative coating the substantially covers the nozzle forming a second outer surface, where the exterior second surface is coated with a glaze of a glass forming frit material (see col. 6, line 20+). See Figure. Benson discovered that a carbon-bonded, oxide refractory material such as

Art Unit: 1774

carbon-bonded alumina graphite in the form of a nozzle can be used to form an anti-buildup liner which is resistant to carbon monoxide gas and resistant to the formation and buildup of alumina (see col. 5, line 12+). Benson applies a glaze to the body to protect the exterior surface of the body against oxidation during firing of the nozzle (see col. 6, line 24+).

Benson essentially claims the instant invention. As previously stated, Benson does not provide an insulative coating composition as that recited in instant claim 19 and 22. However, Brandy discloses an insulative coating composition especially suited for refractory materials such as sleeves at page 1, lines 1-20. The coating provided includes the composition of instant claim 5, teaching insulative microspheres in use at page 2, lines 1-10, page 3, lines 20-30, patented claims 1 and 7, providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the refractive article of Benson to further include a refractive insulative coating composition as instant claim 5 requires because Brandy provides the composition for the purpose of providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. That the metal is capable of melting is not germane since it has been held that an element that is "being able to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,908,577 to Yamamura et al., as applied to claim 1 above, in view of WO 99/65842 to Brandy.

Yamamura essentially teaches the claimed invention. Yamamura does not provide the insulative composition of instant claim 5. However, Brandy discloses an insulative coating

Art Unit: 1774

composition especially suited for refractory materials such as sleeves at page 1, lines 1-20. The coating provided includes the composition of instant claim 5, teaching insulative microspheres in use at page 2, lines 1-10, page 3, lines 20-30, patented claims 1 and 7, providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the refractive article of Yamamura to further include a refractive insulative coating composition as instant claim 5 requires because Brandy provides the composition for the purpose of providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. That the metal is capable of melting is not germane since it has been held that an element that is "being able to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138.

Claims 19-23 (new) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,908,577 to Yamamura et al., as applied to claim 1 above, in view of WO 99/65842 to Brandy.

Yamamura teaches a nozzle for continuous casting of molten metal. The nozzle body 10 has a first surface (encompasses thin-slab nozzle of claim 4), the inner wall part 11 is over 10 (functioning as an outer surface, see Figure 1). The inner wall acts as an insulative coating. Yamamura teaches the green ceramic body is fired, inherently producing a glaze over 11 at col. 9, lines 55-60. At col. 4, lines 4-15, a carbon-containing graphite material is taught. A bore is defined in Figures 1-2.

Yamamura does not provide an insulative coating composition as that recited in instant claims 19 and 22. Brandy discloses an insulative coating composition especially suited for

Art Unit: 1774

refractory materials such as sleeves at page 1, lines 1-20. The coating provided includes the composition of instant claim 5, teaching insulative microspheres in use at page 2, lines 1-10, page 3, lines 20-30, patented claims 1 and 7, providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the refractive article of Yamamura to further include a refractive insulative coating composition as instant claim 5 requires because Brandy provides the composition for the purpose of providing advantages such as easy application and preventive health measures suitable for casting of molten metal. That the metal is capable of melting is not germane since it has been held that an element that is "being able to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 11-7-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

16. Applicant's affidavit has been acknowledged. However, the affidavit does not show convincing evidence or persuasive arguments to teach Yamamura does not provide a glaze. The affidavit does not show that the outer coating cannot act as a glaze. Applicant has not shown what features his invention can show that Yamamura cannot exhibit without a glaze.

15. Applicant contests that the collar (8) of Hanse in Figure 1 only covers a small portion.

The Examiner does not agree. It is a substantial portion as shown in the Figures. The

Art Unit: 1774

Applicant has not included any length measurements to teach the indefinite term "small".

Applicant argues the same portion coverage to Benson. However, Benson also provides a substantial covering in the Figure. The Applicant has not persuasively argued.

16. Applicant argues the absence of microspheres in Benson and Hanse. The Examiner did not use Benson or Hanse in a rejection over the addition of microspheres. Because the amendment now includes the addition in instant claim 19, the Examiner has used Brandy to provide this limitation.

18. Applicant argues that Yamamura does not teach the a "glaze". This argument is not persuasive. When green ceramic is fired, it indeed produces a glassy surface, which is equivalent to providing a glaze (See col. 9, lines 55-60). Applicant further argues that a glaze is not taught during firing. However, this is a process limitation and is not a limitation in the instant claims. Moreover, firing is provided in col. 8. To a glaze produced by firing, it is inherent. The Examiner very well provided a prima facie case, therefore, it is on the Applicant to prove the contrary. Without objective evidence e.g. some showing of differences, the prior art will stand to teach this inherent feature.

19. In response to applicant's argument over Whittemore, Yamamura, and Sara, that rejection was not included in the prior Office Action mailed 8-26-03 and is withdrawn. As the new rejection over Yamamura over Brandy is provided for.

Art Unit: 1774

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamra L. Dicus whose telephone number is (703) 305-3809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-4:30 p.m., alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on (703) 308-0449. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-8329 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

December 10, 2003

Tamra L. Dicus
Examiner
Art Unit 1774

CYNTHIA W. KELLY
SUPERVISOR
TOP SECRETARY OFFICE 1700

Cynthia Kelly